

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/691,435	10/18/2000	Takashi Yamaguchi	00-631	4930	
75	90 09/04/2003				
Bachman & LaPointe, P.C. Suite 1201 900 Chapel Street			EXAMINER		
			ASHBURN; STEVEN L		
New Haven, Cl			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			3714 DATE MAILED: 09/04/2003	14	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>\</b>			$\mathcal{A}_{\alpha}$			
	Application N .	Applicant(s)	9			
Advisory Action	09/691,435	YAMAGUCHI ET AL.				
rationy riodon	Examin r	Art Unit				
	Steven Ashburn	3714				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears n the c ver sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 14 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection	on.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.136(a).	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The approriginally set in the final	opriate extension Office action; or			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
<ul><li>(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</li><li>NOTE:</li></ul>						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-28</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						
MARK SAGER PRIMARY EXAMINER						

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Request for Reconsideration dated August 14, 2003 is unpersuasive. In response to the applicant's argument that the prior art fails to teach a transparent disk member, Kaneko teaches this feature. See office action dated Mar. 14, 2003, p. 4. In response the applicant's argument that the claimed invention distinguishes from the prior art because the prior art does not describe an image under the central part of a rotating member, this feature is not expressed in the claims. In response the applicant's argument that Kaneko does not suggest the a photograph on the back of the rotating unit, this feature would be obvious to an artisan as discussed in the Office Action dated March 14, 2003, p. 5. Consequently, the rejection is maintained..